

UNITED STA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/158,982

Applica.it(s)

- -

Bullard et al.

Examiner

Ardin Marschel

Group Art Unit 1631

X Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Jan 2, 2001</u>	
This action is FINAL .	
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, pr in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay/035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	rosecution as to the merits is closed
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire3r longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the per application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained to the second state of the second seco	riod for response will cause the
Disposition of Claim	
X Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 5-24</u>	is/are pending in the applicat
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration
X Claim(s) <u>8-10 and 13-21</u>	is/are allowed.
X Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, 7, 11, 22, and 24	is/are rejected.
X Claim(s) <u>3, 6, 12, and 23</u>	
Claims are si	
Application Papers	
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	
The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Exam	niner.
The proposed drawing correction, filed on isappro	
The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	P(a)-(d).
All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents	s have been
received.	
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)	·
received in this national stage application from the International Bureau ((PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*Certified copies not received.	
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	19(e).
Attachment(s)	
X Notice of References Cited PTO-892	
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	
X Interview Summary, PTO-413 (2 A al a)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-132	
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE	GES

- 2 - Art Unit: 1631 Serial No. 09/159,982 Applicants' arguments, filed 1/2/01/00, have been fully considered and they are deemed to be persuasive to overcome previous rejections of record. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. Upon reconsideration, however, the following rejections and/or objections are newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application. Due to the setting forth of new grounds of rejection as summarized herein, the finality of the office action, mailed 8/30/00, is hereby withdrawn. Also, the amendment, filed 1/2/01, has been entered. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action: (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 100 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a)\$ as being unpatentable over Farr et al.(F/N 5,811,231).

In the abstract of Farr et al. the measurement of transcription or translation levels from genes is disclosed as related to various stress promoters and/or the action of a compound at the subcellular level. Gene expression as set forth in the instant claims. Figures 1-11 of Farr et al. display said dene expression in a perspective 3-Dimensional manner with paramters for each expression level in the third dimension. One characteristic parameter is concentration of a compound which may alter dene expression and another is the stress promoter being evaluated regarding the gene expression. These stress promoters are discussed, for example, in column 7, line 46, through column 14, line 13. Examples 1-32 in columns 22-32 discuss some exempliary procedures by which to determine gene expression from the expression characterister for the gene being analyzed regarding promoter activity. The perspective 3-D graphs of the results are displayed as summarized in column 3 for the Figures 1-11. The difference between these studies and the instant claims is the usage of computer or automation practice by which to process the data. These automation practices only replace manual activities and are not a patentable distinction as evidenced by the legal decision of In re Venner (120 USFQ 192).

Serial No. 09/158,982 - 4 - Art Unit: 1631 This legal decision at page 194, second column, item [6], states that it is well settled that providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity is not an invention. Thus, as explained further in said decision, there is no patentable distinction in replacing manual activity with an automatic means as instantly claimed. Thus, it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to practice the instant invention because Farr et al. describes the data analysis and display of the instant invention which as noted above is obviously computerized as motivated for efficiency if desired. Claims 3, 6, 12, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8-10 and 18-21 are allowed. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703)308-4242 or (703)305-3014. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703)308-3894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

- 5 -Serial No. 09/158,982 Art Unit: 1631 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703)308-4028. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Patent Analyst, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703)305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196. February 23, 2001 ARDIN H. MARSCHEL PHIMASH EXAMINER